

08-04-'04 14:31 FROM-Lerner & Greenberg

+9549251101

T-216 P03/04 U-682

Amendment No. 10,000,112

-Amdt. dated August 4, 2004

Reply to Office action of July 15, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-50 remain in the application. None of the claims have been amended.

The specification has been amended by entering in the Brief Description of the Drawings an explicit statement that Fig. 2 pertains to a top perspective view and that Fig. 3 pertains to a bottom perspective view. While this is entirely clear from the drawing figures, we have nevertheless provided the change in light of the election requirement. We will return to this issue in the following.

In deference to the election requirement, applicants provisionally elect Group A, Figs. 1, 2, and 4, for prosecution at this time. The requirement is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have difficulty following the logic behind the election requirement. In fact, it is believed that the requirement may be based on a misunderstanding on the Examiner's part and the misunderstanding may have been cleared up by the emphasis of the fact that Fig. 3 is but a bottom perspective view of the housing according to the invention. As explained in the specification, the housing of Fig. 3 contains all of the elements of claim 1 and it contains all of the same

08-04-'04 14:31 FROM-Lerner & Greenberg

+9549251101

T-216 P04/04 U-682

App. No. 10/003,712

Amdt. dated August 4, 2004

Reply to Office action of July 15, 2004

elements as are partly shown in Figs. 1A and 1B, as well as in Fig. 2. It is quite clear that some of the features are not illustrated in the figure because they cannot be seen in the perspective view. Applicants, however, are not aware of any requirement that would cause illustrations of different views in different figures to each contain all of the elements of the other figures. In fact, this would be patently impossible.

A similar argument applies to Fig. 5. All of the figures of the drawing, namely Figs. 1A-5 belong to the claimed invention, they should be grouped as one and they all illustrate the invention of claims 1, 17, and 30.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully urged to rescind the requirement and to examine all of the claims on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants
WHS:tk

WERNER H. STEINER
REG. NO. 34,956

August 4, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101